these authors', as Bouchet has stated (para. 3 of his comment), but has rehabilitated some of them, placed most of them in the synonymy of well known senior names, and proposed the suppression of only five names which threaten an unchallenged, widely known junior name. It would have been easier for Gittenberger to replace *T. geyeri* with one of the senior names, as recommended by Bouchet and Kadolsky, rather than submit a proposal in line with the Code's explicit provisions on maintaining stability. I suspect that no one else will do such a time-consuming revision and prepare a proposal to stabilize the nomenclature if this well substantiated proposal is rejected.

References

Gittenberger, E. 1993a. Digging in the graveyard of synonymy, in search of Portuguese species of *Candidula* Kobelt, 1871 (Mollusca: Gastropoda Pulmonata: Hygromiidae). *Zoologische Mededelingen*, **67**(17): 283–293.

Gittenberger, E. 1993b. On *Cernuella virgata* (Da Costa, 1778) and two Iberian *Xerosecta* species (Mollusca: Gastropoda Pulmonata: Hygromiidae). *Zoologische Mededelingen*, **67**(18): 295–302.

Gittenberger, E. 1993c. On *Trochoidea geyeri* (Soós, 1926) and some conchologically similar taxa (Mollusca: Gastropoda Pulmonata: Hygromiidae). *Zoologische Mededelingen*, **67**(19): 303–320.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, [1797] and *Loligo vulgaris* Lamarck, 1798 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda)

(Case 2922; see BZN **52**: 24–26, 333–335)

Marion Nixon
Geology Department, Birkbeck College, Malet Street, London WC1E 6BT, U.K.

I support the application by Drs Guerra and Alonso-Zarazaga. Both the names *Octopus vulgaris* Cuvier, [1797] and *Loligo vulgaris* Lamarck, 1798 are familiar in zoological works. Besides this, these animals have been widely used in experimental studies for more than 50 years, and are always referred to in the literature by these names, including neurophysiological, psychological and biochemical journals, and also in books. There would be confusion if these names were now changed.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the specific names of *Dodecaceria concharum* Örsted, 1843 and *D. fimbriata* (Verrill, 1879) (Annelida, Polychaeta) by the designation of a neotype for *D. concharum*

(Case 2899; see BZN **52**: 27–33, 261–262, 329–331)

Kristian Fauchald
The Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

Patricia A. Hutchings
The Australian Museum, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia 2000

Tomoyuki Miura
Kagoshima University, Kagoshima, Japan 890

Alexander I. Muir
The Natural History Museum, London SW7 5BD, U.K.

We write as the Nomenclatural Sub-Committee of the International Polychaete Association with a response on the application (BZN **52**: 27–33) by Dr P.H. Gibson and Mr David Heppell to conserve the specific names of *Dodecaceria concharum* Örsted, 1843 and *D. fimbriata* (Verrill, 1879), the comment by Pleijel & Mackie (BZN **52**: 261–262), and the reply by Heppell & Gibson (BZN **52**: 329-331).

1. The argument that the creation of a neotype for *Dodecaceria concharum* from outside the type locality will stabilise the name cannot be substantiated. The species within this genus have been so poorly defined that they can only be separated by specialist polychaete systematists. Therefore it is not surprising that they have been separated in marine faunas (which are compiled from records of specialists) but not differentiated in ecological reports written by generalists.

2. Pleijel & Mackie further suggest that the current distribution of the genus in northern European waters may be more complicated than currently thought and a correct historical interpretation will be less likely to confuse future workers, and we strongly agree with this. We concur fully with Pleijel & Mackie's comment that if the designation of a neotype for *D. concharum* is considered desirable then it should be from one of the localities mentioned by Örsted.

3. The non-systematic literature on the genus *Dodecaceria* is sparse, mainly consisting of papers on reproductive biology by Dr Gibson. If he publishes the correct name in his next paper it will be picked up by future workers and no confusion will occur.

4. We therefore suggest that there is no need for the Commission to use its plenary powers. No confusion will result from agreeing with the correct nomenclatural conclusion of George & Petersen (1991), rather than the reasoning of Gibson & Heppell. There is no justification for suppressing the specific names requested by Gibson & Heppell: *Nereis sextentacula* delle Chiaje, 1828 (see Muir, 1989, for the dating of this paper), *Terebella ostreae* Grube, 1853, *Heterocirrus saxicola* Grube, 1853 and *H. ater* Quatrefages, 1865.

Additional reference

Muir, A.I. 1989. Species of the genus *Sigalion* (Annelida: Polychaeta) reported from north-west European waters, with a note on the authorship of the generic name. *Cahiers de Biologie Marine*, **30**: 339–345.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Monstrilla* Dana, 1849 and *Thaumaleus* Krøyer, 1849 (Crustacea, Copepoda)

(Case 2894; see BZN **52**: 245–249)

Charles C. Davis
Department of Biology, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1B 3X9